## REMARKS

Applicant is filing this Response within the shortened statutory period. Consequently, Applicant believes that no fee is due with this filing; however, if a fee is due please charge Deposit Account No. 502295.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 1, 2008. The Examiner and Applicant's representative, William Guerin, discussed U.S. Patent No. 6851107 B1 to Coad et al. (hereinafter "Coad") with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) according to the final Office Action mailed February 7, 2008. The Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed potential a potential amendment of claim 1 that would include language that more clearly expresses the meaning of the recited phrase "concurrently modified."

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 15 and 16 were presented for examination. The Office Action mailed February 7, 2008 rejects claims 1-4, 7, 8, 15 and 16. Claim 1 is amended herein and claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 are canceled herein. Claims 1-4 are now pending in the application.

### Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Coad. Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 are canceled herein therefore their rejection is rendered moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-4 to the extent that the rejection is maintained against claims 1-4 after the claim amendment made herein because the cited reference does not teach every element and limitation of these claims.

Development of software code is often based on the use of a software modeling tool. A software model is developed and code is then generated from the model. The code is modified and the changes in the code are used to transform the software model. This back and forth process can be repeated until a final version of the code is established. Changes can be made to the software model and changes can be made to the code in parallel (i.e., concurrently) between synchronization events and these changes can be independent of each

other. Thus the changes made to the software model can conflict with the changes made to the code during this time. (See, for example, Applicant's FIG. 2 where model versions and code versions are separately and independently developed between two synchronization events.)

Applicant's claimed method enables the synchronization of the SDAs even though the changes made to the SDAs after the previous synchronization may conflict. Independent claim 1, as set forth after the amendment made herein, recites a method for synchronizing a first artifact and a second artifact where each artifact is "modified independent of a modification to the other artifact after a last synchronization." Thus these recited modifications to the two artifacts can differ and are not part of a synchronization process.

Coad discloses a method which allows a software developer to simultaneously view a graphical display and a textual display of source code. The described software development tool simultaneously reflects any modifications to the source code to both the graphical display of the source code and the textual display of the source code. According to Coad, all modifications are made directly to the source code. A transient meta model 200 generates responsive modifications to both the graphical and textual display representations (204 and 206, respectively) of the code that are based on the modifications to the source code 202. (See generally FIG. 2 and col. 4, line 38 to col. 5, line 3.) Changes made to either the graphical display 204 or the textual display 206 result in actual modification of the source code 202 via an incremental code editor 208 (col. 4, lines 54-58). The transient meta model 200 then generates responsive modifications to the displays 204, 206 based on the modifications made to the source code (col. 4, lines 58-60). Thus Coad teaches only modification of a single artifact (i.e., the software code) between synchronizations. The synchronization process then "updates" the graphical and textual displays to reflect the modification. Although the UML may be synchronized to be consistent with the changes made to the source code, Coad does not teach or suggest how to proceed if both the UML and source code are independently changed between synchronizations.

Thus Coad does not teach or suggest every limitation as now recited in independent claim 1 and therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least those reasons provided above in connection with claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) against claims 2-4 also be withdrawn.

# CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2007
Reg. No. 41,047

/William G. Guerin/
William G. Guerin
Attorney for Applicant
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005